REMARKS

OF

MR. TUCK, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE,

ON THE

NEW HAMPSHIRE CONTESTED ELECTION.

DELIVERED IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, JANUARY 7, 1851.

The House having proceeded to the consideration of the Report of the Committee of Elections in the case of the contested election from the Third District of New Hampshire,

Mr. TUCK said: I know the disadvantage under which any man will speak who follows the eloquent and able gentleman from Kentucky, (Mr. THOMPSON,) and I feel that it borders somewhat upon rashness for me to attempt to add anything to what he has said. Nevertheless there are aspects of this question which may be differently presented by different gentlemen, and I propose to detain the House a short time with those views which have struck my own mind with the greatest force.

To a correct understanding of the merits of the case under consideration, it will be proper to set forth the material facts upon which it arises, and which are agreed upon by the parties. They are the following:

The act of Congress of June 25, 1842, provides that—

"After the 3d day of March, 1843, the House of Representatives shall be composed of members elected agreeably to a ratio of one Representative for each 70,681 persons in each State, and of one additional Representative for each State having a fraction greater than one moiety of the said ratio computed according to the rule prescribed by the Constitution of the United States."

In the second section thereof, said act also provides that—

"In every case where a State is entitled to more than one Representative, the number to which each State is entitled under this apportionment, shall be elected by districts composed of contiguous territory, equal in number to the number of Representatives to which said State may be entitled, no one district electing more than one Representative."

The State of New Hampshire first complied with this direction of Congress, by the act of her Legislature, approved the 2d day of July, 1846, by which the counties of Rockingham and Strafford were made to constitute the first Congressional district; the counties of Merrimack, Belknap, and Carroll, the second; the counties of Hillsborough and Cheshire, the third; and the counties of Sullivan, Grafton, and Coos, the fourth.

Agreeably to this division of districts, the members of the Thirtieth Congress were chosen, and also the members of the Thirty-first Congress; which latter were chosen on the second Tuesday of March, 1849, at which time the Hon. James Wilson was elected from the Third District.

On the 11th day of July, 1850, the Legislature of New Hampshire passed an act, redistricting the State for the choice of members of Congress, by which, among other things, the counties of Hillsborough and Cheshire, together with the towns of Bow, Dunbarton, Henniker, and Hopkinton, in the county of Merrimack, (before that time a part of the Second District,) were made to constitute the Third District; the counties of Rockingham and Strafford, together with the towns of Wakefield, Brookfield, Wolfborough, and Tuftonborough, in the county of Carroll, (before that time a part of the Second District,) should constitute the First District.

On the 9th of September, 1850, the Hon. James Wilson resigned his seat as a member from the third Congressional District, and the Speaker of this House subsequently notified the Executive of the State of the vacancy. The Governor issued his precepts for an election to fill the vacancy before mentioned, to be held on the 8th of October, 1850; and he issued his precepts, not only to the towns constituting the district which

General Wilson represented, but also to the towns of Bow, Dunbarton, Henniker, and Hopkinton, (now represented by General PEASLEE,) which were annexed to the Third District by the act of July, 1850. If the district made vacant by the resignation of General Wilson have a right to fill the vacancy, then Jared Perkins is entitled to his seat, having, in that district, received a majority of two hundred and forty-three votes over all others. If, on the other hand, the votes polled in the towns last mentioned are to be counted with the votes polled in Wilson's district, then George W. Morrison has a majority of sixty-three votes, and is entitled to the seat he occupies.

In examining this case, it would seem appropriate for fair-minded men first to inquire into its equitable merits, and ascertain, if possible, on which side right and justice lie. If it could be shown at the outset that one or the other of the parties immediately interested was manifestly sustained by the elementary principles of republicanism and simple justice, it would be discreditable to the Constitution and laws of the country to admit that we are compelled by them to violate the right and uphold the wrong. I do not hold the Constitution or the laws in such low estimation as to believe that we should ever find ourselves in succh a situation. The Constitution, by making this House judge of the election of its own members, has not only authorized us, but made it our duty, to decide the claims of contestants for seats according to the principles of the Constitution and of commou justice. Where, then, does justice lie in this case? I answer, that I have not yet heard of the man, in New Hampshire or out of it, who was bold enough, after fairly stating the case, to deny that it was manifestly on the side of the contestant. I do not understand the honorable gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. STRONG) as denying this manifest fact; and I venture to assert, that in all we shall hear him say in closing this debate, he will not, as an impartial man, capable of discerning the truth, and bound to sanction the right, wherever found, indorse the equity of the claim made by the sitting member. No, I am confident he cannot do this. He feels bound by what he regards as the letter of the law, and, I have no doubt, feels reluctant to indorse an injustice for the sake of observing the statute. The simple question is this: Shall the people, who lose their Representative by death or resignation, be permitted to choose another to stand in his place? Is it just that they should have this privilege? If so, Jared Perkins, chosen by the people who lost their Representative when General Wilson resigned, has a right this day to take his seat. He was chosen by a handsome majority by the same constituency who, on the 9th of September, ceased to have a Representative upon this floor. Is it just that the inhabitants of four towns, Bow, Dunbarton, Henniker, and Hopkinton, who already have one Representative, chosen in part by themselves, viz. Hon. CHARLES H. PEASLEE, should be permitted to elect another Representative for another constituency? If not just, then George W. Morrison, the sitting member, is not authorized to retain his seat. The equity of the case is apparent from the bare statement. Now, let us inquire whether we have authority to do the justice that is manifest to us.

By a just construction of the districting act of the New Hampshire Legislature of July, 1850, it cannot be held that, as regards the representation of the existing districts in the present Congress, the districting law of 1846 was repealed. Congress was in session, and the members from the several districts had long been in the enjoyment of their seats, with certificates stating that they had been elected by the several districts as members of Congress, for and during the Thirty-first Congress. No vacancy was expected to occur, and it was not in the contemplation of any person to provide any enactment to affect the representation as it then existed, or the rights of representation of the districts as they then existed, during the present Congress. The terms of the act are, in the body of it, to provide for the election of members of Congress; and nothing is contained in the act regarding any vacancy, or any method of procedure, should a vacancy happen. The absence of a provision for an election in case of a vacancy, is a singular feature in the law,

of 1850; and unless resort is had to the districting of 1846, which is said to be repealed there is no authority for the Governor, except under the Constitution of the United States, to issue his precept to fill this vacancy. The law of 1846 is repealed by the act of 1850 only so far as the former is inconsistent with the provisions of the latter. But the method of filling vacancies under the districting of 1846 is not inconsistent with any provision of the act of 1850, which says nothing whatever about vacancies.

But if there could be any doubt about this point, it was removed by the fact that the parties, who were both members of the Legislature of 1850, had agreed before the committee, that a vacancy was not in the contemplation of that body, at the time it was passed. Had it been proposed to interfere with the present representation of the districts, for the remainder of this Congress, there was not a partisan, so run-mad in his zeal, as to sanction such an injustice.

But I confidently assume the position, that the districting law of 1846, under which General Wilson, and the rest of the New Hampshire delegation were elected members of the Thity-first Congress, is absolutely irrepealable, *quoad* this Congress. That act was *functus officio*—it had performed its purpose; the several districts had legally assembled, agreeably to its provisions, and had perfected their representation for one Congress. The act determining the representation had been done by virtue of an existing law, and that law could not be so repealed, as to take away, modify, or affect the representation of the several districts during the period for which they had legally made an election. If a State Legislature pass an act authorizing a district, municipal corporation, or private individuals, to do an act, and the act be done, agreeably to the terms of the law which authorize it, the right acquired under it, and the interests of all parties concerned, have passed beyond legislative power; the act may be repealed, but not so as to lessen the privileges, or take away the titles that may have passed, or been acquired under it. This is law and sound common sense, all the world over, and has received too many sanctions by the highest judicial tribunals in the country, to be called in question at this late day, and it is certainly not to be disregarded in this Hall.

The erroneous notions of the chairman of the committee (Mr. Strong,) as to the purport of the word, vacancy, have led him into many devious, strange, and unsafe paths, in regard to this question. He regards a vacancy as a mere diminution of the number of representatives to which a State is entitled, and he deduces from this assumption the doctrine, that it matters not how the vacancy be filled, so that the full complement of the State is restored. The chairman says, in his report, that "each representative is the representative of the entire people of a State."

There is a sense, I know, in which a representative is the representative of his State, and of his country; but the assertion that he is not especially and particularly the representative of the district which elected him is untenable because it is untrue. When the representatives of a State were elected on a common ticket, by all the voters of the State, then each representative was a representative of the whole people of the State. But under the practice of districting, agreeably to a law of Congress directing it to be done, each member is the representative of his district. The terms representative and constituent are correlative. A member of this House is the representative of his Constituents—of the men who voted for him, and constituted him their representative.

What, then, is a vacancy? It is the fact that a portion of the people are unrepresented. When a member resigns his seat, that portion of the people whose representative he was, have lost their power of being heard upon this floor, and are entitled, by the Constitution, to have it restored. In order to ascertain who ought to participate in an election to fill a vacancy, it is only necessary to inquire what constituency the late member represented. There is in this case a vacancy in the representation of that portion of the people who chose General Wilson to serve them during the whole of this

Congress; and when you have found that subdivision of the State which sent him here, you have found where the people reside who are not heard in this House, and who, in the person of the contestant, demand their constitutional rights at your hands. If you refuse him admittance, you refuse to allow the people to be represented. Nature abhors a vacuum in space, and republicanism abhors a vacuum in popular representation. Taxation without representation, was an assumption, the opposition to which led our fathers into a war that lasted eight years, and has been called glorious. They were careful to provide against the maxim they abhorred, in the Constitution of their adoption; and it is to be hoped that we shall not repudiate the sentiments which they defended at so much cost, and cherished with so much affection.

This was an election to fill a vacancy. But there was no vacancy in district No. 3, as constituted by the act of 1850. The portion of the district which makes up Mr. Morrison's majority, already have a representative, elected in part by their own votes. That representative is my colleague, General Peaslee. Let us see whether this double representation is lawful, and whether it is republican.

The second section of the act of Congress of June, 1842, which I quoted at the commencement of my remarks, is expressed in the provision, that "no one district shall elect more than one representative." How gentlemen, who acknowledge the obligation of this statute of Congress, can find their way open to vote for the sitting member, is utterly beyond my comprehension. Nothing upon earth can be clearer than that the towns of Bow, Dunbarton, Henniker, and Hopkinton, now have two representatives upon this floor, and will be doubly represented, so long as Mr. Morrison retains his seat. Sustain his claim and you sustain the principle, that one district can have two representatives, and you violate the law of 1842.

The Chairman (Mr. Strong) is aware of this fatal objection, and he furnishes a miserably lame apology for the consciences of his partizans in the following sentence in his report:

"The instant these four towns [the towns taken from General Peaslee's district] were severed from the second district and united to the third, the inhabitants ceased to be represented by Mr. Peaslee, even in the sense in which the phrase is used by the contestant, and were represented by Mr. Wilson."

The assertion in this extract is utterly absurd, and fully demonstrates the weakness of a cause which drives its advocates to such desperate resorts. Has the re-districting of 1850, altered the fact as to what portion of the people elected General Peaslee, and what portion elected General Wilson? Each of those gentlemen was the Representative of those who participated in his election, and of those only. The people of Wilson's district gave him his right to a seat here. He was their Representative, and they were his constituents. These terms are co-relative, and the assertion that when the new districting law took effect, the people of certain towns acquired a new Representative, and the Representative acquired a new constituency is absurdity and nonsense.

The attempt to keep Mr. Morrison in his seat also involves a sanction of double voting. The people of four towns have voted once for a Representative to the whole of this Congress, and the claim is set up that their votes shall be counted again. We have driven the advocate of Mr. Morrison to the wall on this subject also, and the following sentence in his report shows the way he gets over the difficulty. He coolly lays down this proposition:

"There is, however, no constitutional or legal provision which prohibits such voting, (double voting,) and your committee are not informed that even its propriety has ever been assailed."

If the Chairman has not been informed that the propriety of such voting has ever been assailed, I will inform him that it is because, that up to the present time no man has been found bold enough to advocate it. For a man to vote twice is, in most of the States, an offence deservedly punished with the Penitentiary. It is a violation of the

rights of others, and a gross infraction upon the sanctity of the elective franchise. The man who coolly advocates the propriety of four towns being permitted to vote twice, has a boldness amounting to hardihood of the most unblushing kind.

Some years since, a prominent politician in New Hampshire was charged with voting twice at an election; and the circumstances, or facts, or allegations, I forget which, being rather strong against him, he came nigh losing his good name forever, even among his own party. To call him "the double voter," was to brand him with an epithet as opprobrious as that of rogue. But here gentlemen argue the commonness and propriety of double voting, with as much coolness as they would demonstrate a proposition in mathematics, and with shocking gravity ask this House to admit double representation—to admit it, too, against the express law of the land!

But it is said that Wilson's district is rendered a non-enity, by the repeal of the law of 1846 in the act of 1850, and that, therefore, a precept could not be issued by the Governor to what had no existence. I think that I have shown that the districting of 1846 was neither repealed nor repealable, *quoad* the Thirty-first Congress. But to waive that for a moment, it may be safely alleged that the contestant needs only the stipulations of the Constitution to give him his place in this House. In the second section of the first article of the Constitution, is contained the following clause:

"When vacancies happen in the representation of any State, the Executive authority thereof shall issue writs of election to fill such vacancies."

The Governor of New Hampshire need not look to the statute book of the State to find a description of his duty when a vacancy happens in the delegation. It is pointed out in the organic law of the land, and his duty, without looking to the districting law of the State passed in 1850, was to inquire which district, as represented by the delegation, was vacant, and then to issue his precepts to that portion of the State which was without a representative—to those who had lost their servant upon this floor. The Constitution is ample and sufficient; and we ask no help, and we admit no hindrance, from the districting law of the State. Mr. Perkins comes here with the Constitution in one hand and an admitted majority of two hundred and forty-three votes in the other, and in the name of the Constitution, and of his constituents, demands his and their rights.

It is assumed on the other side, that because Gen. Wilson represented the old Third District, the new Third District shall fill the vacancy occasioned by his resignation. Let us see how this assumption would work in practice. Suppose that Gen. Wilson's district had, by the late act, been divided in the middle, I demand to know which half should be allowed to fill the vacancy? The answer will be, of course, that half which makes a part of the new district, called number Three. But which half shall participate in the election, if the numbering be changed, and a distant portion of the State, not including any part of the vacant district, be called the Third District? The answer must be, on their hypothesis, the new district, No. 3. Thus the whole pretensions of our opponents are disposed of by a perfect *reductio ad absurdum*.

But to show the chairman, and all others, what sort of practice a ratification of his positions will lead to, I will invite him to look for a moment to the State of Massachusetts. My position is, that after the people of a district have participated in the election of one man to Congress, they cannot be united with adjoining territory for the purpose of filling a vacancy, and electing another member to the same Congress. This my position is controverted by the chairman and others. There has been a vacancy for two years in the Fourth Congressional District in the State of Massachutetts. The Whigs have till now been in the ascendency, and have had the power at any time to convene their Legislature, and reconstruct the districts, to suit themselves. The Representative from the Suffolk district was elected by a large majority, and could have safely spared at any time more than enough of his constituents to settle the annoying controversy in the Cambridge

district. If, after electing one Representative, they could lawfully be joined to another district, and help their neighbors make a choice, why has it not been done? It is because so monstrous a proposition has not yet found a single advocate in the old Bay State. No man has yet been found bold enough to advocate, or sufficiently regardless of his reputation to propose, that people who have elected one Representative to Congress, shall be permitted to control the representation of other people in the same Congress. Establish the unsound and dangerous assumption which is now advocated by the chairman, and you will promulgate a novel and most unlooked-for method of filling the seven vacancies now existing in Massachusetts for the Thirty-second Congress. Their Legislature is now in session, and the Whig party, so long in the ascendant, are in the minority. Three districts have elected Whigs to the Thirty-second Congress, and seven vacancies are to be filled. How easy to extract from the districts that have chosen, the opposition elements, and to coop up in those districts the Whig strength of the State, and thus make all the seven districts just what the legislative majority see fit to make them.

I now come to the last topic of my remarks, namely, the inequality and injustice of the act of 1850, which all this singular philosophy, these nice distinctions and astounding positions, are brought out to sustain. I shall attempt to show the true character of the bantling which all this nursing and tending is designed to keep alive and foster; and I hope to satisfy you that the thing is not worth raising. Conceived in sin and brought forth in iniquity, will more properly apply to this than to any other production of the age.

In 1846, the allied forces, so called, had control of the New Hampshire Legislature; and besides many other beneficial acts, they divided the State into Congressional Districts in a manner which commanded the approval of the people generally, and received the votes of a large portion of the Democratic members of that body. County lines were not broken in any case; former associations were preserved; and from that time to the present, the admission has been universal, that the division was as fair as could possibly have been effected. By that division, and while majority law was in force, the Second and Fourth Districts only, were able to elect Democratic members of the Thirtieth Congress. Some remedy seemed necessary for this evil, and in 1848, when the Democracy again had control of the State, a law was passed, providing for the election of members of Congress by plurality. It was thought this would be sufficient to restore a full Democratic representation. But the election for the members of the Thirty-first Congress, came on in March, 1849, and the Democratic leaders found too late, that the plurality law had not saved them, and that the same men were elected in the First and Third Districts as before. They then concluded that violent diseases required violent remedies, and the Legislature was beset in 1849, and again in 1850, to furnish some new facilities for Congressional aspirants, beyond what the already fair division of the State would allow. The party repelled the proposition in 1849; but in 1850, their sense of justice was overcome, and the new districting law was accomplished.

In order to be able to lay before the House such facts as would expose the merits of the act of 1850, I have ascertained from the marshal of the State, who completed the census, soon after the late act was passed, the following statistics.

The population of the several districts, as formed by the act of July 11, 1850, is as follows:

District No. 1	contains	.....	83,874
" No. 2	"	.....	67,198
" No. 3	"	.....	93,449
" No. 4	"	.....	68,110

District No. 3, contains, by this division, a population of 26,251 more than district No. 2. To make the Third District so much larger than the Second District, the following towns, of the population stated, were set off from No. 2 to No. 3, namely:

Bow	1,055
Dunbarton	915
Henniker	1,690
Hopkinton	2,169
Making in all a population of	5,829

So that before these towns were taken from No. 2 and added to No. 3, the latter contained a population of 20,422 greater than the former; and after this Democratic equalization, the difference was, as before stated, 26,251.

Let us now turn to the remedy which was provided for the evil of an unsatisfactory representation in the First District, which I have the honor to represent. There were four towns, also, taken from the Second District, and annexed to the First, and with the following names and population:

Brookfield	552
Tuftonborough	1,305
Wakefield	1,405
Wolfboro	2,038
Making in all a population of	5,300

Before these towns were taken from No. 2 and added to No. 1, the latter had already a population of 11,376 more than the former. After this Democratic justice was administered to us, No. 1 contains 16,676 more inhabitants than No. 2, and is thought to be tolerably secure of accomplishing the object for which the new districting was concocted, provided that a proper degree of medical attention can keep in subjection, till after the March election, the natural tendency to independence and self-respect, into which the towns last mentioned are quite liable to fall.

The two Democratic districts contain a population of 135,308; the two other districts a population of 177,323. The difference is 42,015. The law of Congress gives one Representative to every 70,681 inhabitants, and one additional Representative for every State having a fraction above this number, larger than the half of it. Neither of the two Democratic districts has a population that, under the apportionment by Congress, entitles them to one Representative, while the two other districts have a fraction above the apportionment number, more than adequate to give them an additional Representative, if they were a separate State.

A portion of the people, a little larger than one-third of the population, are to select two Representatives to Congress, while the remaining two-thirds, or a fraction less, are to send the same number. In the South, five slaves are equal to two white persons, in right of representation. In New Hampshire, our Democratic brethren have embarked in the enterprise of giving two Democrats the same weight of representation as three Whigs.

Now, I confidently assert, that you may hunt in vain from one end of the country to the other, for another instance in partisan legislation, of similar disregard of the maxims of equal and impartial justice, and of like encroachment by a legislative majority upon the rights of their fellow-citizens. I hold up this disfranchising law, with the accompanying data, for the condemnation of the country, and in some faint hope that it may bring to repentance some of the men who lent themselves, perhaps unwillingly, and after much entreaty, to the perpetration of such a gross act of injustice, I hold it up before the people of New Hampshire, and I say in this place, from which I hope they may all, by and by, hear my words, that I have yet to meet the man, of any party, however zealous he might be, who could look at this transaction, without volunteering his unqualified reprobation. Let it be known in New Hampshire, that no man who has advocated the claim of the sitting member, does so, except through the supposed direful necessity, on account of the forms of the law, of supporting an act, unjust and revolting in its character. I say it, more in sorrow than in anger, that this act is a blot upon the fair escutcheon of our State, which every true son of New Hampshire ought to be anxious to wipe away, at the earliest possible period.

I will also apologize somewhat, even for the Democratic party of that State, and say what I believe, that this act was not their spontaneous production. It was wrung from the legislature, after two sessions of persevering importunity and persevering artifice, for the purpose of making one of the districts so strongly Democratic, that a man could be elected to Congress simply by the momentum of party organization, without any aid from personal reputation. I do not allude in this remark to my friend, (Mr. Morrison,) who is not known to me as favoring the redistricting at the time the proposition was before the Legislature. I throw out the remark for such application as the members of the Legis-

lature and the people of the State, who are apt to keep their eyes open, choose to make of it.

I will also, in the way of apology for my Democratic friends, say that I am informed, on such authority as satisfies me, although I do not vouch for its correctness, that several plans were proposed in caucus for paving the way for aspirants to a seat in Congress. One was to annex the town of Pittsfield to No. 1; which town, through their Representative, revolted at the purpose to which the town was to be subjected, and met the proposition with the assurance, that if the thing were done, every vote in the town should be given to the Whig candidate. So, also, of the town of Barnstead, whose representative also rejected the proposition, with that sort of scorn which honest men would be likely to feel, and broke the coils that were about enfolding him. To consign the honest Democracy of these old towns to the ungenerous office of disfranchising their fellow-citizens, was an undertaking of difficult accomplishment. Such a medicine for disabled Democracy was rather difficult to force down the throats of a spirited people, although it were recommended by ever so skillful a doctor. I do not think that anything short of chloroform would make a patient passive under such an operation.

But the Democracy of Pittsfield and Barnstead were abandoned, and the search was made in the hill country for others, who might have to come thirty miles further to do the dishonest service, but who were thought to be more willing to answer the humiliating object in view. It remains to be seen, whether the yeomanry of Wakefield, Brookfield, and Tuftonborough, will bow submissively to that which their neighbors in Barnstead and Pittsfield revolted at. Have they no indignation for the purchased villains who could be bought up in Philadelphia, to be transported to New York, to vote and carry an election there? And will they lend themselves to the office of disfranchising their fellow-citizens? Let them answer this question at the ballot-box. If it must needs be, that we are to be disfranchised, we would prefer that it should be done by the more convenient and less humbling process of importations, rather than be done by our own people.

Now, sir, I have nearly done. I wish only to invoke this House to rise above the technical difficulties that have been raised, and which, alone, can prevent a just determination of the case, and to give such a judgment as will satisfy good men of all parties. I can assure gentlemen that the people of New Hampshire are an honest people, and that a refusal by this House to spread over the districting law of 1850 the shield of their protection, will meet with a hearty approval among the masses of all parties.

This House is, by the Constitution, made judge of the election of its own members. This duty is secured to us with the design of guarding the elective franchise, and protecting the rights of the people. The fundamental principles of republicanism are always to be regarded, and never permitted, in one single instance, to be trodden down. If we permit artifice and dishonesty to triumph over the honest demands of the people for a just and equal representation, we shake the confidence of the people, sap the foundations of the government, and fail of performing the duty which the Constitution has imposed upon us. If we sanction an erroneous principle, although it may be apparently trifling, as in this instance, merely effecting a representation for two months, yet the bad example will recoil upon us hereafter, and produce mischief to the country. I conclude by moving to amend the resolution offered by the chairman of the committee, so that it will read:

Resolved, That Jared Perkins is entitled to a seat in this House, as a member from the third district in the State of New Hampshire, to fill the vacancy occasioned by the resignation of the Hon. James Wilson.

Note—On next day, (January 8, 1851,) after the delivery of the above speech, Mr. Tuck made the following statement to the House of Representatives, as a matter of privilege.

In my remarks yesterday on the election case from New Hampshire, I stated that I had received from the marshal a statement of the population of the several districts. I have in my hand the letter from the marshal to which I yesterday referred. I received by this morning's mail a second letter from the marshal, in which he informs me that in one particular he committed an error in the statistics provided. Although the error made does not materially affect the argument, yet I am happy that the correction has arrived before the close of the debate, and I think it just to communicate it to the House at this time. The error was in stating the population of the second district to be sixty-seven thousand one hundred and ninety-eight, when it ought to be, as he states this morning, seventy-one thousand five hundred and sixty-four.